

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the official action dated September 30, 2005, and the references it cites. In the official action, claims 1-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nethery, III (“Nethery”) and claims 7, 14, and 21 were objected to for having minor grammatical informalities. In addition, claims 49-54 were allowed and, thus, will not be discussed further herein. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

By way of the foregoing amendments, the applicant has amended claims 7, 14, and 21 to correct the grammatical informalities and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections thereto. In addition, the applicant submits herewith an amended abstract to address the examiner’s objection in connection with the use of the term “disclosed.” Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the abstract.

Turning to the art rejections, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 1 is directed to a method and recites, *inter alia*, determining a number of pixels associated with forming at least a first bar and a second bar of a first barcode character and determining at least one separation width value associated with the first bar and the second bar based on the number of pixels. Nethery does not teach or suggest determining at least one separation width value associated with the first bar and the second bar based on the number of pixels associated with forming at least the first bar and the second bar. Instead, Nethery teaches forming a bar section (44) having an adjacent space (45) such that the bar section (44) and the adjacent space (45) constitute a white width WW8 to black width WW8 ratio of one (i.e., $WW8/WB8 = 1$). *See* Netherly, col. 4, ll. 23-25. The white width WW8 to black width WW8 ratio is not associated with the number of pixels in any other bar and, thus, does not constitute determining at least one separation width value

associated with the first bar and the second bar based on the number of pixels associated with forming at least the first bar and the second bar. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.


The applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 8 and 15 are also allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 15, and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is also allowable over the art of record. Claim 22 is directed to a method and recites, *inter alia*, determining a first number of pixels associated with forming a first barcode character, determining a second number of pixels associated with forming a second barcode character, and comparing the first number of pixels to the second number of pixels. Although Nethery depicts a bar section (44) in FIGS. 7 and 8 associated with a number of pixels as indicated in the official action, Nethery does not teach or suggest comparing a first number of pixels associated with forming a first barcode character to a second number of pixels associated with forming a second barcode character. Therefore, Nethery does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 22. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 31 and 40 are also allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 22. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 31, 40, and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any remaining matters that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark G. Hanley", is written over a horizontal line.

Mark G. Hanley
Reg. No. 44,736
Attorney for Applicant
Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
(at customer number **34431**)
20 North Wacker Drive
Suite 4220
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.580.1020

Dated: **February 23, 2006**